

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,913	DAHL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Staples	1637	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Staples. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Jason Bond. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 May 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lorincz et al. (US Patent No. 6,136,535).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. \_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant argued that Lorincz et al. do not teach a single strand circular DNA which is the construct, Applicant argued, that results from claim 1 step 2. Applicant pointed out that Figure 1A of Lorincz et al. does not show one single strand circular DNA but portions which are double-stranded, as the figure combines two strands in such a way that a circular template results from having one semi-circular single strand joined to form a circular template by two sections of double strand DNA with a portion in between the two double strands which is a length of single strand from another second single strand DNA. Examiner advised Attorney that the claim should clearly point out the essential claim element of one single strand circular DNA. Applicant also argued that Lorincz et al. do not teach using a primer which is an anti-sense promoter oligonucleotide as recited in step 3 of claim 1. Examiner conveyed he would consider these arguments in further review of Lorincz et al. and the prior art.